arXiv:1607.07159v1 [math.AP] 25 Jul 2016

COUPLING OF SYMMETRIC OPERATORS AND THE THIRD GREEN IDENTITY

JUSSI BEHRNDT, VLADIMIR DERKACH, FRITZ GESZTESY, AND MARIUS MITREA

Abstract. The principal aim of this paper is to derive an abstract form of the third Green identity associated with a proper extension T of a symmetric operator S in a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, employing the technique of quasi boundary triples for T. The general results are illustrated with couplings of Schrödinger operators on Lipschitz domains on smooth, boundaryless Riemannian manifolds.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Quasi Boundary Triples and their Weyl Functions 5
3. The Coupling Model 6
4. The Third Green Identity 12
5. Coupling of Schrödinger Operators on Lipschitz Domains on Manifolds 15
References 24

1. Introduction

The origin of this paper can be traced back to the following innocent question: *How to rule out that a Dirichlet eigenfunction of the Laplacian, or, more generally, a uniformly elliptic second order partial differential operator on a nonempty, open, bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with sufficiently regular boundary, is also simultaneously a Neumann eigenfunction?*

There are, of course, several immediate answers. For instance, in the case of the Dirichlet Laplacian on a sufficiently regular, open, bounded, domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$-\Delta u = \lambda u, \quad u \restriction_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \ u \in H^2(\Omega), \tag{1.1}$$

Rellich's identity from [34] for (necessarily real) Dirichlet eigenvalues λ reads,

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{4\|u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}} \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(\xi)\right)^2 \left(\frac{\partial |x|^2}{\partial \nu}(\xi)\right) d^{n-1}\omega(\xi). \tag{1.2}$$

Date: July 26, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47A10, 47A57, 47B25, 58J05, 58J32; Secondary 47A55, 47B15, 58J50.

Key words and phrases. Symmetric operators, self-adjoint extensions, generalized resolvents, boundary triples, Weyl–Titchmarsh functions, Schrödinger operator, Lipschitz domain.

J. B. gratefully acknowledges financial support by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project P 25162-N26; M. M. is indebted to the Simons Foundation for support under Grant # 281566; V.D. is indebted to the Fulbright Fund for support under Grant # 68130028.

Here $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ lies in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$, $d^{n-1}\omega$ denotes the surface measure on $\partial\Omega$, ν is the outward pointing unit normal vector at points of $\partial\Omega$, and $\partial/\partial\nu$ represents the normal derivative,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu} := \nu(\xi) \cdot \nabla_\xi, \quad \xi \in \partial\Omega. \tag{1.3}$$

Thus, vanishing of the normal derivative (i.e., the Neumann boundary condition) $\partial u/\partial\nu|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ yields $\lambda = 0$ which contradicts the well-known fact that the Dirichlet Laplacian is strictly positive on bounded (in fact, finite Euclidean volume) domains Ω. (More general domains such as Lipschitz could be discussed in the context of the examples mentioned in this introduction, but for brevity we stick to sufficiently regular, say, C^2-domains, throughout. We will, however, consider Lipschitz domains on a smooth, boundaryless manifold in Section 5.)

A second approach, based on

$$\mathring{H}^2(\Omega) = \big\{v \in H^2(\Omega) \,\big|\, u \restriction_{\partial\Omega} = (\partial_\nu u) \restriction_{\partial\Omega} = 0\big\}, \tag{1.4}$$

again for Ω sufficiently regular, shows that

$$-\Delta u = \lambda u, \quad u \restriction_{\partial\Omega} = (\partial_\nu u) \restriction_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \ u \in H^2(\Omega), \tag{1.5}$$

cannot have any nonzero solution u as the zero extension $\widetilde{u}$ of u outside Ω lies in $H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and hence $-\Delta$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ would have a compactly supported eigenfunction, clearly a contradiction. This extends to more general uniformly elliptic second order partial differential operators via unique continuation principles, see, for instance, [2], [3], [20], [23], [24], [25], and [36].

An approach, intimately related to the second approach, adding a functional analytic flavor, would employ the fact that the Dirichlet and Neumann Laplacians in $L^2(\Omega)$, denoted by $-\Delta_{D,\Omega}$ and $-\Delta_{N,\Omega}$, respectively, are relatively prime and hence satisfy

$$\operatorname{dom}(-\Delta_{D,\Omega}) \cap \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta_{N,\Omega}) = \mathring{H}^2(\Omega) = \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta_{min,\Omega}). \tag{1.6}$$

Here the associated minimal and maximal operators in $L^2(\Omega)$ are of the form

$$-\Delta_{min,\Omega} = -\Delta, \quad \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta_{min,\Omega}) = \mathring{H}^2(\Omega), \tag{1.7}$$

$$-\Delta_{max,\Omega} := -\Delta, \quad \operatorname{dom}(-\Delta_{max,\Omega}) := \big\{f \in L^2(\Omega) \,\big|\, \Delta f \in L^2(\Omega)\big\}, \tag{1.8}$$

where the expression Δf, $f \in L^2(\Omega)$, is understood in the sense of distributions, and one has the relations

$$-\Delta^*_{min,\Omega} = -\Delta_{max,\Omega}, \quad -\Delta_{min,\Omega} = -\Delta^*_{max,\Omega} \tag{1.9}$$

(see, for instance, [4, Sect. 3]). Invoking the fact that the minimal operator $-\Delta_{min,\Omega}$ is simple (i.e., it has no invariant subspace on which it is self-adjoint), and simple operators have no eigenvalues, $-\Delta_{min,\Omega}$ cannot have any eigenvalues, thus, no nonzero solution u satisfying (1.5) exists. For recent results of this type see, for instance, [9, Proposition 2.5]. Upon modifications employing appropriate Dirichlet and Neumann traces this approach remains applicable to the more general case of uniformly elliptic second order partial differential operators on Lipschitz domains Ω (see, e.g., [4], [9]).

Perhaps, a most illuminating proof of the impossibility of a Dirichlet eigenfunction to be simultaneously a Neumann eigenfunction can be based on the third Green identity, which naturally leads to one of the principal topics of this paper. Assuming again $\partial\Omega$ to be sufficiently regular (we will treat the case of Lipschitz

domains in Section 5), we note the following well-known special case of the third Green identity (see, e.g., [12], [28, Theorem 6.10]),

$$u(x) = (\mathcal{G}_z(-\Delta - z)u)(x) + (\mathcal{D}_z u)(x) - (\mathcal{S}_z(\partial_\nu u))(x), \\ u \in H^2(\Omega),\ z \in \mathbb{C},\ x \in \Omega, \tag{1.10}$$

in terms of the resolvent operator $\mathcal{G}_z$, and the single and double layer potentials $\mathcal{S}_z$ and $\mathcal{D}_z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$, defined by

$$(\mathcal{G}_z f)(x) = \int_\Omega E_n^{(0)}(z; x-y) f(y)\, d^n y, \quad f \in L^2(\Omega),\ x \in \Omega, \tag{1.11}$$

$$(\mathcal{S}_z v)(x) = \int_{\partial\Omega} E_n^{(0)}(z; x-\xi) v(\xi)\, d^{n-1}\omega(\xi), \quad v \in L^2(\partial\Omega),\ x \in \Omega, \tag{1.12}$$

$$(\mathcal{D}_z v)(x) = \int_{\partial\Omega} \big(\partial_{\nu(\xi)} E_n^{(0)}\big)(z; x-\xi) v(\xi)\, d^{n-1}\omega(\xi), \quad v \in L^2(\partial\Omega),\ x \in \Omega. \tag{1.13}$$

Here $E_n^{(0)}(z;x)$ represents the fundamental solution of the Helmholtz differential expression $(-\Delta - z)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$, that is,

$$E_n^{(0)}(z;x) = \begin{cases} (i/4)\big(2\pi|x|/z^{1/2}\big)^{(2-n)/2} H^{(1)}_{(n-2)/2}\big(z^{1/2}|x|\big), & n \geq 2,\ z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}, \\ \frac{-1}{2\pi}\ln(|x|), & n = 2,\ z = 0, \\ \frac{1}{(n-2)\omega_{n-1}}|x|^{2-n}, & n \geq 3,\ z = 0, \end{cases} \\ \operatorname{Im}\big(z^{1/2}\big) \geq 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\{0\}, \tag{1.14}$$

with $H_\nu^{(1)}(\,\cdot\,)$ denoting the Hankel function of the first kind with index $\nu \geq 0$ (cf. [1, Sect. 9.1]).

Thus, if u is assumed to satisfy (1.5), the third Green identity (1.10) instantly yields $u \restriction_\Omega = 0$ and hence the nonexistence of nontrivial solutions u satisfying (1.5). Again, this approach extends to the more general case of uniformly elliptic second order partial differential operators $\mathcal{L}$ by appropriately replacing the Helmholtz Green's function $G_n^{(0)}(z;x,y) = E_n^{(0)}(z;x-y)$ of $\mathcal{L}^{(0)} = -\Delta - z$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ in (1.10)–(1.14) by the associated Green's function $G_n(z;x,y)$ of $\mathcal{L} - z$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Although we were interested in properties of Dirichlet eigenfunctions, that is, eigenfunctions of the Dirichlet Laplacian $-\Delta_{D,\Omega}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, the third Green identity (1.10) naturally involved the Helmholtz Green's function $G_n^{(0)}(z;x,y) = E_n^{(0)}(z;x-y)$ for the Laplacian in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The latter obviously has no knowledge of Ω and $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, denoting

$$\Omega_+ := \Omega, \quad \Omega_- := \mathbb{R}^n\backslash\overline{\Omega}, \tag{1.15}$$

with Ω_- the open exterior of Ω, one is naturally led to a comparison of the Dirichlet Laplacian

$$(-\Delta_{D,\Omega_+}) \oplus (-\Delta_{D,\Omega_-}) \text{ in } L^2(\Omega_+) \oplus L^2(\Omega_-) \simeq L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \tag{1.16}$$

and the Laplacian $-\Delta$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (with domain $H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$). While the Dirichlet Laplacian $(-\Delta_{D,\Omega_+}) \oplus (-\Delta_{D,\Omega_-})$ corresponds to a complete decoupling of $\mathbb{R}^n$ into $\Omega_+ \cup \Omega_-$ (ignoring the compact boundary $\mathcal{C} := \partial\Omega_\pm$ of n-dimensional Lebesgue measure zero), in stark contrast to this decoupling, the Laplacian $-\Delta$ on $H^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ couples Ω_+ and Ω_- via the imposition of continuity conditions accross $\mathcal{C}$ of the form

$$u_+ \restriction_{\partial\Omega_+} = u_- \restriction_{\partial\Omega_-}, \quad -\partial_\nu u_+ \restriction_{\partial\Omega_+} = \partial_\nu u_- \restriction_{\partial\Omega_-}. \tag{1.17}$$

Here we identified $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the pair $(u_+, u_-) \in L^2(\Omega_+) \oplus L^2(\Omega_-)$ via $u_\pm = u \restriction_{\Omega_\pm}$. The relative sign change in the normal derivatives in the second part of (1.17) is of course being dictated by the opposite orientation of ν at a point of $\mathcal{C} = \partial\Omega_\pm$. (It should be said that at this point we are purposely a bit cavalier about boundary traces, etc., all this will be developed with complete rigor in the bulk of this paper.) It is this coupling of Ω_+ and Ω_- through their joint boundary $\mathcal{C}$ via the Laplacian $-\Delta$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ via the continuity requirements (1.17) that's the second major topic in this paper.

In fact, from this point of view, the open exterior domain Ω_- is on a similar level as the original domain $\Omega = \Omega_+$ (apart from being unbounded) and introducing the jumps of u and $\partial_\nu u$ across $\mathcal{C} = \partial\Omega_\pm$ via

$$[u] := u_+ \restriction_{\partial\Omega_+} - u_- \restriction_{\partial\Omega_-}, \quad [\partial_\nu u] := -\partial_\nu u_+ \restriction_{\partial\Omega_+} - \partial_\nu u_- \restriction_{\partial\Omega_-}, \tag{1.18}$$

the third Green identity (1.10) can be shown to extend to the following form (symmetric w.r.t. $\Omega_\pm$, cf., e.g., [12], [28, Theorem 6.10]),

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &= (\mathcal{G}_z(-\Delta - z)u)(x) + (\mathcal{D}_z[u])(x) - (\mathcal{S}_z([\partial_\nu u]))(x), \\ & u = (u_+, u_-),\ u_\pm \in H^2(\Omega_\pm),\ z \in \mathbb{C},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \backslash \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.19}$$

At this point we can describe the major objectives of this paper: Decompose a given complex, separable Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ into an orthogonal sum of closed subspaces $\mathfrak{H}_\pm$ as $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{H}_-$, consider densely defined, closed symmetric operators $S_\pm$ in $\mathfrak{H}_\pm$ and their direct sum $S = S_+ \oplus S_-$ in $\mathfrak{H}$, introduce restrictions $T_\pm$ of $S_\pm^*$ such that $\overline{T_\pm} = S_\pm^*$ and appropriate restrictions $A_{0,\pm}$ of $T_\pm$, for instance, $A_{0,\pm}$ self-adjoint in $\mathfrak{H}_\pm$, defined in terms of certain abstract boundary conditions, and then find a self-adjoint operator A in $\mathfrak{H}$ which closely resembles $A_0 = A_{0,+} \oplus A_{0,-}$, but without any remnants of the boundary conditions in $A_{0,+} \oplus A_{0,-}$ and without any reference to the decomposition of $\mathfrak{H}$ into $\mathfrak{H}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{H}_-$ (i.e., A naturally couples $\mathfrak{H}_\pm$ in terms of certain continuity requirements through an abstract "boundary"). Finally, derive an abstract third Green identity invoking the resolvent (resp., the Green's function $\mathcal{G}$) of A, the operator $T = T_+ \oplus T_-$, and abstract single and double layer operators constructed from $\mathcal{G}$. This can indeed be achieved with the help of an appropriate quasi boundary triple for T which also permits one to introduce a natural abstract analog of the "boundary Hilbert space" $L^2(\mathcal{C})$ in the concrete case of the Laplacian above.

In Section 2 we briefly recall the basic setup for quasi boundary triples and associated operator-valued Weyl-functions (also called Weyl–Titchmarsh functions) as needed in this paper. The introduction of quasi boundary triples is intimately connected with an abstract (second) Green identity. Section 3 studies the operator A and derives Krein-type resolvent formulas for it in terms of A_0 and a related operator. Section 4 derives the abstract third Green identity, and finally Section 5 illustrates the abstract material in Sections 2–4 with the concrete case of Schrödinger operators on Lipschitz domains on smooth, boundaryless Riemannian manifolds.

Finally, we briefly summarize the basic notation used in this paper: Let $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathfrak{H}$ be a separable complex Hilbert spaces, $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\mathcal{H}}$ the scalar product in $\mathcal{H}$ (linear in the second factor), and $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ the identity operator in $\mathcal{H}$. If T is a linear operator mapping (a subspace of) a Hilbert space into another, $\operatorname{dom}(T)$ denotes the domain of T. The closure of a closable operator S is denoted by $\overline{S}$. The spectrum and

resolvent set of a closed linear operator in $\mathcal{H}$ will be denoted by $\sigma(\cdot)$ and $\rho(\cdot)$, respectively. The Banach spaces of bounded linear operators in $\mathcal{H}$ are denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$; in the context of two Hilbert spaces, $\mathcal{H}_j$, $j = 1, 2$, we use the analogous abbreviation $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$. The set of all closed linear operators in $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, $\mathcal{X}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{X}_2$ denotes the continuous embedding of the Banach space $\mathcal{X}_1$ into the Banach space $\mathcal{X}_2$. We also abbreviate $\mathbb{C}_\pm := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, \mathrm{Im}(z) \gtrless 0\}$.

2. Quasi Boundary Triples and their Weyl Functions

In this section we briefly recall the notion of quasi boundary triples and the associated (operator-valued) Weyl functions.

In the following let S be a densely defined closed symmetric operator in $\mathfrak{H}$.

Definition 2.1. *Let $T \subseteq S^*$ be a linear operator in $\mathfrak{H}$ such that $\overline{T} = S^*$. A triple $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ is called a* quasi boundary triple *for T if $(\mathcal{H}, (\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,)_\mathcal{H})$ is a Hilbert space and $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1 : \mathrm{dom}(T) \to \mathcal{H}$ are linear mappings such that the following items (i)–(iii) hold:*

(i) *The abstract (second) Green identity*

$$(Tf, g)_\mathfrak{H} - (f, Tg)_\mathfrak{H} = (\Gamma_1 f, \Gamma_0 g)_\mathcal{H} - (\Gamma_0 f, \Gamma_1 g)_\mathcal{H}, \quad f, g \in \mathrm{dom}(T), \tag{2.1}$$

is valid.

(ii) *The map $\Gamma = (\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)^\top : \mathrm{dom}(T) \to \mathcal{H}^2$ has dense range.*

(iii) *$A_0 := T \restriction \ker(\Gamma_0)$ is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathfrak{H}$.*

The notion of quasi boundary triples was introduced in [5] and generalizes the concepts of ordinary (and generalized) boundary triples, see, for instance, [11], [19], [21], [26], and the references therein. We recall that the triple in Definition 2.1 is called an *ordinary boundary triple* (*generalized boundary triple*) if item (ii) is replaced by the condition $\mathrm{ran}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{H}^2$ ($\mathrm{ran}(\Gamma_0) = \mathcal{H}$, respectively). On the other hand, the notion of quasi boundary triple is a partial case of the notion of isometric/unitary boundary triples which goes back to Calkin [13] and was studied in detail in [15], [17].

We recall briefly some important properties of quasi boundary triples. First of all, we note that a quasi boundary triple for S^* exists if and only if the defect numbers

$$n_\pm(S) = \dim(\ker(S^* \mp i)) \tag{2.2}$$

of S are equal. Next, assume that $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ is a quasi boundary triple for $T \subseteq S^*$. Then the mapping $\Gamma = (\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1)^\top : \mathrm{dom}(T) \to \mathcal{H}^2$ is closable and $\ker(\Gamma) = \mathrm{dom}(S)$ holds (cf. [5, Proposition 2.2]). According to [5, Theorem 2.3] one has $T = S^*$ if and only if $\mathrm{ran}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{H}^2$, in this case the restriction $A_0 = S^* \restriction \ker(\Gamma_0)$ is automatically self-adjoint and the the quasi boundary triple $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ is an ordinary boundary triple in the usual sense. In this context we also note that in the case of finite deficiency indices of S a quasi boundary triple is automatically an ordinary boundary triple.

Next, the notion of the *γ-field* and *Weyl function* associated to a quasi boundary triple will be recalled. The definition is formally the same as in the case of ordinary and generalized boundary triples. First, one observes that for each $z \in \rho(A_0)$, the direct sum decomposition

$$\mathrm{dom}(T) = \mathrm{dom}(A_0) \dotplus \ker(T - zI_\mathfrak{H}) = \ker(\Gamma_0) \dotplus \ker(T - zI_\mathfrak{H}) \tag{2.3}$$

holds. Hence the restriction of the mapping Γ_0 to $\ker(T - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$ is injective and its range coincides with $\operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0)$.

Definition 2.2. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ be a quasi boundary triple for $T \subseteq S^*$. The* γ-field γ *and the* Weyl function M *corresponding to $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ are defined by*

$$\rho(A_0) \ni z \mapsto \gamma(z) := \big(\Gamma_0 \restriction \ker(T - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})\big)^{-1}, \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\rho(A_0) \ni z \mapsto M(z) := \Gamma_1 \gamma(z), \tag{2.5}$$

respectively.

The notions of the γ-field and the Weyl function corresponding to ordinary and generalized boundary triples were introduced in [18] and [19], respectively. In both cases the Weyl function M turns out to be a Herglotz–Nevanlinna function with values in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, that is, M is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$, and

$$\operatorname{Im}(z) \operatorname{Im}(M(z)) \geqslant 0 \text{ and } M(z) = M(\overline{z})^*, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}. \tag{2.6}$$

The values of the γ-field are bounded operators from $\mathcal{H}$ into $\mathfrak{H}$ with $\operatorname{ran}(\gamma(z)) = \ker(T - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$ and the following identity holds

$$M(z) - M(z)^* = (z - \bar{z})\gamma(z)^*\gamma(z), \quad z \in \rho(A_0). \tag{2.7}$$

In the case of a quasi boundary triple the operators $\gamma(z)$, $z \in \rho(A_0)$, are defined on the dense subspace $\operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ and map onto $\ker(T - zI_{\mathfrak{H}}) \subset \mathfrak{H}$. By [5, Proposition 2.6] the operator $\gamma(z)$ is bounded and hence admits a continuous extension onto $\mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, one has

$$\gamma(z)^* : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathcal{H}, \quad f \mapsto \gamma(z)^* f = \Gamma_1 (A_0 - \overline{z} I_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} f, \quad z \in \rho(A_0). \tag{2.8}$$

The values of the Weyl function $M(z)$, $z \in \rho(A_0)$ are operators in $\mathcal{H}$ defined on $\operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0)$ and mapping into $\operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_1)$. The analogs of (2.6) and (2.7), and various other useful and important properties of the Weyl function can be found in [5], [6]. In particular,

$$M(z) \subseteq M(\overline{z})^*, \quad z \in \rho(A_0), \tag{2.9}$$

and hence the operators $M(z)$, $z \in \rho(A_0)$, are closable operators in $\mathcal{H}$. We point out that the operators $M(z)$, $z \in \rho(A_0)$, and their closures are generally unbounded.

3. The Coupling Model

In this section we discuss the coupling issue mentioned in (1.15)–(1.17) from a purely abstract point of view.

Let S_+ and S_- be densely defined closed symmetric operators in the separable Hilbert spaces $\mathfrak{H}_+$ and $\mathfrak{H}_-$, respectively, and assume that the defect indices of S_+ and S_- satisfy

$$n_+(S_+) = n_-(S_+) = n_+(S_-) = n_-(S_-) = \infty. \tag{3.1}$$

The case of finite defect numbers can be treated with the help of ordinary boundary triples in an efficient way and will not be discussed here (cf. [14]).

Let T_+ and T_- be such that $\overline{T}_+ = S_+^*$ and $\overline{T}_- = S_-^*$, and assume that $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+\}$ and $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^-, \Gamma_1^-\}$ are quasi boundary triples for S_+^* and S_-^*, respectively. The corresponding γ-fields and Weyl functions are denoted by γ_+ and γ_-, and M_+ and M_-, respectively. Furthermore, let

$$A_{0,+} = T_+ \restriction \ker(\Gamma_0^+), \quad A_{0,-} = T_- \restriction \ker(\Gamma_0^-). \tag{3.2}$$

It is important to note that the identities

$$\gamma_+(z)^* = \Gamma_1^+(A_{0,+} - \overline{z})^{-1}, \quad \gamma_-(z)^* = \Gamma_1^-(A_{0,-} - \overline{z})^{-1}, \tag{3.3}$$

hold for all $z \in \rho(A_{0,+})$ and $z \in \rho(A_{0,-})$, respectively (cf. (2.8)). In the following consider the operators

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} S_+ & 0 \\ 0 & S_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} T_+ & 0 \\ 0 & T_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad S^* = \begin{pmatrix} S_+^* & 0 \\ 0 & S_-^* \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.4}$$

in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{H}_-$. It is clear that S is a closed, densely defined, symmetric operator in $\mathfrak{H}$ with equal infinite defect numbers,

$$n_+(S) = n_-(S) = \infty, \tag{3.5}$$

and that

$$\overline{T} = S^*. \tag{3.6}$$

The elements f in the domain of S, T and S^* will be written as two component vectors of the form $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top$, where $f_\pm$ belongs to the domain of $S_\pm$, $T_\pm$ and $S_\pm^*$, respectively. It is easy to see that $\{\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$, where

$$\Gamma_0 f = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0^+ f_+ \\ \Gamma_0^- f_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma_1 f = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_1^+ f_+ \\ \Gamma_1^- f_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad f \in \operatorname{dom}(T), \tag{3.7}$$

is a quasi boundary triple for S^* such that

$$A_0 = T \restriction \ker(\Gamma_0) = \begin{pmatrix} T_+ \restriction \ker(\Gamma_0^+) & 0 \\ 0 & T_- \restriction \ker(\Gamma_0^-) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{0,+} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{0,-} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.8}$$

One notes that $\rho(A_0) = \rho(A_{0,+}) \cap \rho(A_{0,-})$. The γ-field γ and Weyl function M corresponding to the quasi boundary triple $\{\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ are given by

$$\gamma(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_+(z) & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_-(z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad z \in \rho(A_0), \tag{3.9}$$

$$M(z) = \begin{pmatrix} M_+(z) & 0 \\ 0 & M_-(z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad z \in \rho(A_0), \tag{3.10}$$

and (3.3) implies

$$\gamma(z)^* f = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_1^+(A_{0,+} - \overline{z})^{-1} f_+ \\ \Gamma_1^-(A_{0,-} - \overline{z})^{-1} f_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \mathfrak{H}. \tag{3.11}$$

The next result, Theorem 3.1, can be viewed as an abstract analogue of the coupling of differential operators, where $\Gamma_0^\pm$ are Dirichlet trace operators and $\Gamma_1^\pm$ are Neumann trace operators acting on different domains (cf. Section 5 for more details). We also note that in the following the operators $M_+(z) + M_-(z)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ are assumed to be defined on $\operatorname{dom}(M_+(z)) \cap \operatorname{dom}(M_-(z))$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+\}$ and $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^-, \Gamma_1^-\}$ be quasi boundary triples for S_+^* and S_-^* with Weyl functions $M_\pm$ and define*

$$A := T \restriction \big\{ f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T) \,\big|\, \Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \Gamma_0^- f_-,\, \Gamma_1^+ f_+ = -\Gamma_1^- f_- \big\}. \tag{3.12}$$

Then the following assertions (i)–(iii) hold:

(i) A is a symmetric operator in $\mathfrak{H}$.

(ii) $z \in \rho(A_0)$ is an eigenvalue of A if and only if

$$\ker\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big) \neq \{0\}. \tag{3.13}$$

(iii) A is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathfrak{H}$ if and only if

$$\operatorname{ran}\big(\Gamma_1^{\pm} \restriction \operatorname{dom}(A_{0,\pm})\big) \subset \operatorname{ran}\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big) \tag{3.14}$$

holds for some (and hence for all) $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and some (and hence for all) $z \in \mathbb{C}_-$.

If A is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathfrak{H}$ then for all $z \in \rho(A) \cap \rho(A_0)$ the resolvent of A is given in terms of a Krein-type resolvent formula by

$$(A - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} = (A_0 - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} + \gamma(z)\Theta(z)\gamma(\overline{z})^*, \tag{3.15}$$

where

$$\Theta(z) = -\begin{pmatrix} (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} & (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} \\ (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} & (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.16}$$

Remark 3.2. One notes that the perturbation term $\gamma(z)\Theta(z)\gamma(\overline{z})^*$ on the right-hand side of (3.15) can also be written in the form

$$-\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_+(z) \\ \gamma_-(z) \end{pmatrix} (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} \big(\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*, \, \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*\big). \tag{3.17}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. *(i)* In order to show that A is a symmetric operator in $\mathfrak{H}$ let $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top$ and $g = (g_+, g_-)^\top$ be in $\operatorname{dom}(A)$. Making use of the abstract boundary conditions for $f, g \in \operatorname{dom}(A)$, a straightforward computation using the abstract Green identity (2.1) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &(Af, g)_{\mathfrak{H}} - (f, Ag)_{\mathfrak{H}} \\ &\quad = (T_+f_+, g_+)_{\mathfrak{H}_+} - (f_+, T_+g_+)_{\mathfrak{H}_+} + (T_-f_-, g_-)_{\mathfrak{H}_-} - (f_-, T_-g_-)_{\mathfrak{H}_-} \\ &\quad = (\Gamma_1^+ f_+, \Gamma_0^+ g_+)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\Gamma_0^+ f_+, \Gamma_1^+ g_+)_{\mathcal{H}} + (\Gamma_1^- f_-, \Gamma_0^- g_-)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\Gamma_0^- f_-, \Gamma_1^- g_-)_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad = (\Gamma_1^+ f_+ + \Gamma_1^- f_-, \Gamma_0^+ g_+)_{\mathcal{H}} - (\Gamma_0^+ f_+, \Gamma_1^+ g_+ + \Gamma_1^- g_-)_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

hence A is symmetric.

(ii) Let $z \in \rho(A_0)$ and assume that z is an eigenvalue of A. Considering $f \in \ker(A - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$, $f \neq 0$, one observes that $\Gamma_0 f \neq 0$ as otherwise $f \in \operatorname{dom}(A_0)$ would be an eigenfunction of A_0 at z. Clearly $f \in \ker(T - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$ and hence $M(z)\Gamma_0 f = \Gamma_1 f$. For $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top$ one then obtains

$$M_+(z)\Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \Gamma_1^+ f_+ \text{ and } M_-(z)\Gamma_0^- f_- = \Gamma_1^- f_-. \tag{3.19}$$

Since $f \in \operatorname{dom}(A)$ satisfies $\Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \Gamma_0^- f_-$ and $\Gamma_1^+ f_+ + \Gamma_1^- f_- = 0$, one concludes

$$\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big)\Gamma_0^{\pm} f_{\pm} = M_+(z)\Gamma_0^+ f_+ + M_-(z)\Gamma_0^- f_- = \Gamma_1^+ f_+ + \Gamma_1^- f_- = 0. \tag{3.20}$$

As a consequence of $\Gamma_0^{\pm} f_{\pm} \neq 0$, it follows that $\ker(M_+(z) + M_-(z)) \neq \{0\}$.

Conversely, assume that $\varphi \in \ker(M_+(z) + M_-(z))$, $\varphi \neq 0$, for some $z \in \rho(A_0)$. One notes that

$$M_+(z)\varphi = -M_-(z)\varphi \text{ and } \varphi \in \operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0^+) \cap \operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0^-). \tag{3.21}$$

Hence there exist $f_+ \in \ker(T_+ - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_+})$ and $f_- \in \ker(T_- - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_-})$ such that

$$\Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \varphi = \Gamma_0^- f_-. \tag{3.22}$$

From the definition of M_+ and M_-, and (3.21)–(3.22) one concludes that

$$\Gamma_1^+ f_+ = M_+(z)\Gamma_0^+ f_+ = -M_-(z)\Gamma_0^- f_- = -\Gamma_1^- f_-, \tag{3.23}$$

and hence (3.22) and (3.23) show that $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \ker(T - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$ satisfies both abstract boundary conditions for elements in $\operatorname{dom}(A)$. Thus, $f \in \ker(A - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$.

(iii) First, assume that A is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathfrak{H}$, fix $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$, and let

$$\varphi_+ \in \operatorname{ran}\big(\Gamma_1^+ \restriction \operatorname{dom}(A_{0,+})\big). \tag{3.24}$$

Then there exists $f_+ \in \mathfrak{H}_+$ such that

$$\varphi_+ = \Gamma_1^+(A_{0,+} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_+})^{-1} f_+ = \gamma_+(\overline{z})^* f_+, \tag{3.25}$$

where the last identity follows from (3.3). Next, consider $f = (f_+, 0)^\top \in \mathfrak{H}$, set

$$h := (A - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} f - (A_0 - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} f \in \ker(T - zI_{\mathfrak{H}}), \tag{3.26}$$

and

$$k := (A - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} f \in \operatorname{dom}(A). \tag{3.27}$$

Then one has $\Gamma_0 h = \Gamma_0 k$ and $\Gamma_1 h = \Gamma_1 k - \gamma(\overline{z})^* f$ and hence

$$\gamma(\overline{z})^* f = \Gamma_1 k - \Gamma_1 h = \Gamma_1 k - M(z)\Gamma_0 h = \Gamma_1 k - M(z)\Gamma_0 k. \tag{3.28}$$

Making use of (3.25) and $f_- = 0$ this reads componentwise as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_+ = \gamma_+(\overline{z})^* f_+ &= \Gamma_1^+ k_+ - M_+(z)\Gamma_0^+ k_+, \\ 0 = \gamma_-(\overline{z})^* f_- &= \Gamma_1^- k_- - M_-(z)\Gamma_0^- k_- \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

(cf. (3.11)). Summing up these two equations and taking into account that $k \in \operatorname{dom}(A)$ satisfies $\Gamma_1^+ k_+ + \Gamma_1^- k_- = 0$ and $\Gamma_0^+ k_+ = \Gamma_0^- k_-$, one finds

$$\varphi_+ = \gamma_+(\overline{z})^* f_+ = -\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big)\Gamma_0^+ k_+. \tag{3.30}$$

Hence, the inclusion

$$\operatorname{ran}\big(\Gamma_1^+ \restriction \operatorname{dom}(A_{0,+})\big) \subseteq \operatorname{ran}\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big) \tag{3.31}$$

holds for any $z \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\mathbb{R}$. In the same way as above one also shows the inclusion

$$\operatorname{ran}\big(\Gamma_1^- \restriction \operatorname{dom}(A_{0,-})\big) \subseteq \operatorname{ran}\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big). \tag{3.32}$$

Next, we will prove the converse. Assume that

$$\operatorname{ran}\big(\Gamma_1^\pm \restriction \operatorname{dom}(A_{0,\pm})\big) \subseteq \operatorname{ran}\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big) \tag{3.33}$$

holds for some $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and some $z \in \mathbb{C}_-$. We have to prove that the operator A is self-adjoint in $\mathfrak{H}$. Along the way we will also show that the resolvent formula holds at the point z. Note first that A is symmetric by item (i) and hence all eigenvalues of A are real. In particular, z is not an eigenvalue of A and according to item (ii), the operator $M_+(z) + M_-(z)$ is injective. Let $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \mathfrak{H}$ and note that (cf. (3.11))

$$\gamma(\overline{z})^* f = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_1^+(A_{0,+} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_+})^{-1} f_+ \\ \Gamma_1^-(A_{0,-} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_-})^{-1} f_- \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.34}$$

and that

$$\Gamma_1^\pm(A_{0,\pm} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_\pm})^{-1} f_\pm \in \operatorname{ran}\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big) = \operatorname{dom}\big((M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1}\big), \tag{3.35}$$

by assumption. Now consider the element

$$g := (A_0 - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} f - \gamma(z) \begin{pmatrix} (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} & (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} \\ (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} & (M_+(z) + M_-(z))^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \gamma(\overline{z})^* f, \tag{3.36}$$

which is well-defined by the above considerations and the fact that

$$\operatorname{dom}(\gamma(z)) = \operatorname{dom}\left(\begin{pmatrix}\gamma_+(z) & 0\\ 0 & \gamma_-(z)\end{pmatrix}\right) = \operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0^+)\times\operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0^-), \tag{3.37}$$

and

$$\operatorname{ran}\big((M_+(z)+M_-(z))^{-1}\big) = \operatorname{dom}\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big) = \operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0^+)\cap\operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_0^-). \tag{3.38}$$

Since $(A_0-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1}f\in\operatorname{dom}(A_0)\subset\operatorname{dom}(T)$ and $\operatorname{ran}(\gamma(z)) = \ker(T-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})\subset\operatorname{dom}(T)$, it is clear that $g\in\operatorname{dom}(T)$. Next, it will be shown that $g=(g_+,g_-)^\top$ satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\Gamma_0^+g_+ = \Gamma_0^-g_- \text{ and } \Gamma_1^+g_+ = -\Gamma_1^-g_-. \tag{3.39}$$

Due to

$$(A_0-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix}(A_{0,+}-zI_{\mathfrak{H}_+})^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & (A_{0,-}-zI_{\mathfrak{H}_-})^{-1}\end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.40}$$

and the special form of $\gamma(z)$ and $\gamma(\overline{z})^*$, one infers that

$$g_+ = (A_{0,+}-zI_{\mathfrak{H}_+})^{-1}f_+ - \gamma_+(z)\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big)^{-1}\big(\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ + \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_-\big), \tag{3.41}$$

and

$$g_- = (A_{0,-}-zI_{\mathfrak{H}_-})^{-1}f_- - \gamma_-(z)\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big)^{-1}\big(\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ + \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_-\big). \tag{3.42}$$

Since by definition, $A_{0,\pm} = T_\pm\restriction\ker(\Gamma_0^\pm)$ and $\gamma_\pm(z) = (\Gamma_0^\pm\restriction\ker(T_\pm - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_\pm}))^{-1}$, one obtains

$$\Gamma_0^+g_+ = -\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big)^{-1}\big(\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ + \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_-\big), \tag{3.43}$$

$$\Gamma_0^-g_- = -\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big)^{-1}\big(\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ + \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_-\big), \tag{3.44}$$

and hence the first condition in (3.39) is satisfied. Next, we make use of (3.3) and $M_\pm(z) = \Gamma_1^\pm\gamma_\pm(z)$ and compute

$$\Gamma_1^+g_+ = \gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ - M_+(z)\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big)^{-1}\big(\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ + \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_-\big), \tag{3.45}$$

$$\Gamma_1^-g_- = \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_- - M_-(z)\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big)^{-1}\big(\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ + \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_-\big). \tag{3.46}$$

It follows that $\Gamma_1^+g_+ + \Gamma_1^-g_- = 0$ and hence also the second boundary condition in (3.39) is satisfied. Therefore, $g\in\operatorname{dom}(A)$, and when applying $(A-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$ to g it follows from the particular form of g and $\operatorname{ran}(\gamma(z))\subseteq\ker(T-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})$ that

$$(A-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})g = (T-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})(A_0-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1}f = f. \tag{3.47}$$

Furthermore, as A is symmetric, z is not an eigenvalue of A and one concludes that

$$(A-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1}f = g. \tag{3.48}$$

Since $f\in\mathfrak{H}$ was chosen arbitrary it follows that $(A-zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1}$ is an everywhere defined operator in $\mathfrak{H}$. By our assumptions this is true for a point $z\in\mathbb{C}_+$ and for a point $z\in\mathbb{C}_-$. Hence it follows that A is self-adjoint and that the resolvent of A at the point z has the asserted form, proving assertion *(iii)*.

It remains to show that the resolvent of A is of the form as stated in the theorem for all $z\in\rho(A)\cap\rho(A_0)$. For this we remark that

$$\gamma_+(\overline{z})^*f_+ + \gamma_-(\overline{z})^*f_- \in \operatorname{ran}\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big) \tag{3.49}$$

holds for all $z \in \rho(A) \cap \rho(A_0)$ and $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \mathfrak{H}$; this follows essentially from the first part of the proof of item (iii) (which remains valid for points in $\rho(A) \cap \rho(A_0)$). Based on (3.49) and the fact that $\ker(M_+(z) + M_-(z)) = \{0\}$ for all $z \in \rho(A) \cap \rho(A_0)$ by assertion (ii), it can be shown in the same way as in the second part of the proof of item (iii) that the resolvent of A has the asserted form. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

The next step is to derive a slightly modified formula for the resolvent of A in Theorem 3.1 where the resolvent of A_0 is replaced by the resolvent of the operator

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{0,+} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{1,-} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.50}$$

where

$$A_{1,-} = T_- \restriction \ker(\Gamma_1^-) \tag{3.51}$$

is assumed to be a self-adjoint operator in $\mathfrak{H}_-$. We recall that in the context of quasi boundary triples, the extension $A_{1,-}$ of S_- corresponding to $\ker(\Gamma_1^-)$ is always symmetric, but generally not self-adjoint. The resolvent formula in the next theorem is essentially a consequence of Theorem 3.1 and a formula relating the resolvent of $A_{0,-}$ with the resolvent of $A_{1,-}$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+\}$ and $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^-, \Gamma_1^-\}$ be quasi boundary triples for S_+^* and S_-^* with Weyl functions $M_\pm$ as in Theorem* 3.1. *Assume, in addition, that $A_{1,-} = T_- \restriction \ker(\Gamma_1^-)$ is self-adjoint in $\mathfrak{H}_-$, and let A in Theorem* 3.1 *be self-adjoint in $\mathfrak{H}$. Then for all $z \in \rho(A) \cap \rho(A_{0,+}) \cap \rho(A_{0,-}) \cap \rho(A_{1,-})$ the resolvent of A is given by*

$$(A - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{0,+} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{1,-} \end{pmatrix} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}} \right)^{-1} + \widehat{\gamma}(z)\Sigma(z)\widehat{\gamma}(\overline{z})^*, \tag{3.52}$$

where

$$\widehat{\gamma}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_+(z) & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_-(z)M_-(z)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma(z) = -\begin{pmatrix} M_+(z) & I_{\mathcal{H}} \\ I_{\mathcal{H}} & -M_-(z)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}^{-1}. \tag{3.53}$$

Proof. Since $A_{1,-} = T_- \restriction \ker(\Gamma_1^-)$ is self-adjoint in $\mathfrak{H}_-$ it follows from [6, Theorem 6.16] that $M_-(z)$ is injective for all $z \in \rho(A_{0,-}) \cap \rho(A_{1,-})$ and the resolvents of $A_{0,-}$ and $A_{1,-}$ are related via

$$(A_{0,-} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_-})^{-1} = (A_{1,-} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}_-})^{-1} + \gamma_-(z)M_-(z)^{-1}\gamma_-(\overline{z})^* \tag{3.54}$$

for all $z \in \rho(A_{0,-}) \cap \rho(A_{1,-})$. Making use of (3.8) and inserting (3.54) in (3.15)–(3.16) one obtains

$$(A - zI_{\mathfrak{H}})^{-1} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{0,+} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{1,-} \end{pmatrix} - zI_{\mathfrak{H}} \right)^{-1} + \widehat{\gamma}(z)\Psi(z)\widehat{\gamma}(\overline{z})^*, \tag{3.55}$$

where

$$\Psi(z) = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_-(z) \end{pmatrix} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_-(z)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} + \Theta(z) \right] \begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & M_-(z) \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.56}$$

and we have used that

$$\big(\gamma_-(\overline{z})M_-(\overline{z})^{-1}\big)^* = \big(M_-(\overline{z})^*\big)^{-1}\gamma_-(\overline{z})^* = M_-(z)^{-1}\gamma_-(\overline{z})^*. \tag{3.57}$$

Here the first equality holds since $\gamma_-(\overline{z})^*$ is everywhere defined and bounded, and the second equality is valid since $M_-(z)^{-1} \subset (M_-(\overline{z})^*)^{-1}$ and

$$\operatorname{ran}(\gamma_-(\overline{z})^*) \subset \operatorname{ran}(\Gamma_1) = \operatorname{dom}\big(M_-(z)^{-1}\big), \quad z \in \rho(A_{0,-}) \cap \rho(A_{1,-}). \tag{3.58}$$

The block operator matrix $\Psi(z)$ in $\mathcal{H}^2$ has the form

$$\Psi(z) = \begin{pmatrix} -\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big)^{-1} & -\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big)^{-1} M_-(z) \\ -M_-(z)\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big)^{-1} & M_+(z)\big(M_+(z) + M_-(z)\big)^{-1} M_-(z) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.59}$$

and from this representation one infers that $\Psi(z) = \Sigma(z)$ for all $z \in \rho(A) \cap \rho(A_{0,+}) \cap \rho(A_{0,-}) \cap \rho(A_{1,-})$. □

In the case where $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+\}$ is an ordinary boundary triple, equation (3.52) was proved in [16, eq. (6.7)] (cf. also [14]).

4. The Third Green Identity

This section is devoted to an abstract version of the Third Green identity (cf. (1.19) for the concrete example that motivated these investigations).

We will investigate the operator

$$A = T \restriction \big\{ f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T) \,\big|\, \Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \Gamma_0^- f_-,\, \Gamma_1^+ f_+ = -\Gamma_1^- f_- \big\}, \tag{4.1}$$

which corresponds to the coupling of the quasi-boundary triples $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+\}$ and $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^-, \Gamma_1^-\}$ for S_-^* and S_+^* in Theorem 3.1. One recalls that A is a symmetric operator in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{H}_-$. From now on we shall assume that the following hypothesis is satisfied (cf. Theorem 3.1 (*iii*)).

Hypothesis 4.1. *The operator A in* (4.1) *is self-adjoint in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$.*

In the following let $\mathfrak{H}_2 := \operatorname{dom}(A)$ be the Hilbert space with inner product

$$(f, g)_{\mathfrak{H}_2} := (Af, Ag)_{\mathfrak{H}} + (f, g)_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad f, g \in \operatorname{dom}(A), \tag{4.2}$$

and let $\mathfrak{H}_{-2}$ be the adjoint space of distributions on $\mathfrak{H}_2$ with the pairing denoted by

$${}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle h, g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2}, \quad g \in \mathfrak{H}_2,\ h \in \mathfrak{H}_{-2}. \tag{4.3}$$

Since for every $f \in \mathfrak{H}$ the functional $(f, \cdot\,)_{\mathfrak{H}}$ is bounded on $\mathfrak{H}_2$, the space $\mathfrak{H}$ embeds densely into the space $\mathfrak{H}_{-2}$ in such a way that (cf. [10, Section 1])

$${}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle f, g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2} = (f, g)_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad f \in \mathfrak{H},\ g \in \mathfrak{H}_2, \tag{4.4}$$

leading to a Gelfand triple of the form

$$\mathfrak{H}_2 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{H} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{H}_{-2}. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the dual operator to A determined by

$${}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle \mathcal{A}f, g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2} := (f, Ag)_{\mathfrak{H}}, \quad f \in \mathfrak{H},\ g \in \mathfrak{H}_2. \tag{4.6}$$

Since $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}_2, \mathfrak{H})$, also $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}, \mathfrak{H}_{-2})$.

Next, define the map Υ on $\mathfrak{H}_2 = \operatorname{dom}(A)$ as the restriction of $(\Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+)^\top$,

$$\Upsilon : \mathfrak{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^2, \quad f \mapsto \Upsilon f = \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_0 f \\ \Upsilon_1 f \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0^+ f_+ \\ \Gamma_1^+ f_+ \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0^- f_- \\ -\Gamma_1^- f_- \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.7}$$

Here the last equality follows from the abstract boundary conditions in (4.1) for all $f \in \operatorname{dom}(A)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume Hypothesis* 4.1 *and suppose that* A *in* (4.1) *corresponds to the coupling of the quasi-boundary triples* $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+\}$ *and* $\{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma_0^-, \Gamma_1^-\}$ *for* S_-^* *and* S_+^**, respectively. Then the operators* $\Upsilon_0, \Upsilon_1 : \mathfrak{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}$ *in* (4.7) *are bounded.*

Proof. We start by showing that the map Υ is closable from $\mathfrak{H}_2$ to $\mathcal{H}^2$. Assume that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n = 0, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} Af_n = 0, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \Upsilon_0 f_n = \varphi, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \Upsilon_1 f_n = \psi \tag{4.8}$$

for some $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then by (4.7),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} f_{n,+} = 0, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} T_+ f_{n,+} = 0, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \Gamma_0^+ f_{n,+} = \varphi, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \Gamma_1^+ f_{n,+} = \psi. \tag{4.9}$$

Since the map $(\Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+)^\top : \operatorname{dom}(T) \to \mathcal{H}^2$ is closable by [5, Proposition 2.2] one concludes that $\varphi = \psi = 0$ and hence the map $\Upsilon : \mathfrak{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^2$ is closable. Since $\operatorname{dom}(\Upsilon) = \mathfrak{H}_2$, it follows that Υ is closed, and the closed graph theorem implies that $\Upsilon : \mathfrak{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}^2$ is bounded. Thus, also $\Upsilon_0, \Upsilon_1 : \mathfrak{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}$ are bounded. □

Let $\Upsilon_j^* : \mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{H}_{-2}$ be the dual operator to $\Upsilon_j : \mathfrak{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}$, $j = 0, 1$, in (4.7) determined by

$$_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle \Upsilon_j^* \varphi, g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2} := (\varphi, \Upsilon_j g)_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{H},\ g \in \mathfrak{H}_2,\ j = 0, 1. \tag{4.10}$$

Since Υ_j are bounded operators from $\mathfrak{H}_2$ to $\mathcal{H}$ by Lemma 4.2, it is clear that Υ_j^*, $j = 1, 2$, are bounded operators from $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathfrak{H}_{-2}$.

Next we introduce an abstract analog of the single and double layer potential (cf. [28]). For this it will be assumed that there is an abstract fundamental solution operator for $\mathcal{A}$.

Hypothesis 4.3. *There exists a bounded operator* $\mathcal{G} : \mathfrak{H}_{-2} \to \mathfrak{H}$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{G}\mathcal{A} f = f, \quad f \in \operatorname{dom}(T). \tag{4.11}$$

Definition 4.4. *Assume Hypotheses* 4.1 *and* 4.3 *and let* $\Upsilon_0^*, \Upsilon_1^* : \mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{H}_{-2}$ *be defined by* (4.10)*. The abstract* single *and* double layer potentials *are defined by*

$$\mathcal{S} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{H}, \\ \varphi \mapsto \mathcal{G}\Upsilon_0^* \varphi, \end{cases} \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{H}, \\ \varphi \mapsto \mathcal{G}\Upsilon_1^* \varphi, \end{cases} \tag{4.13}$$

respectively.

It is clear that the operators $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are well-defined and bounded. In order to obtain an abstract third Green identity in the next theorem we will also use the following notations for the "jumps" of boundary values:

$$[\Gamma_0 f] := \Gamma_0^+ f_+ - \Gamma_0^- f_-, \quad f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T), \tag{4.14}$$

and

$$[\Gamma_1 f] := \Gamma_1^+ f_+ + \Gamma_1^- f_-, \quad f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T). \tag{4.15}$$

One observes that the jump notations in (4.14)–(4.15) are compatible with the boundary conditions for elements in $\operatorname{dom}(A)$; we note that different signs are used in (4.15) since in the application in Section 5 the operators $\Gamma_1^\pm$ will be the normal derivatives with the normals having opposite direction.

Theorem 4.5. *Assume Hypotheses* 4.1 *and* 4.3 *and suppose that A in* (4.1) *corresponds to the coupling of the quasi-boundary triples $\{\mathcal{H},\Gamma_0^+,\Gamma_1^+\}$ and $\{\mathcal{H},\Gamma_0^-,\Gamma_1^-\}$ for S_-^* and S_+^*, respectively. Let $[\Gamma_0\cdot]$, $[\Gamma_1\cdot]$, $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be defined as above. Then*

$$f = \mathcal{G}Tf + \mathcal{D}[\Gamma_0 f] - \mathcal{S}[\Gamma_1 f], \quad f \in \operatorname{dom}(T). \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. Let $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T)$ and $g = (g_+, g_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(A)$. Then it follows from (4.6) and the abstract Green identity (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle \mathcal{A}f, g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2} &= (f, Ag)_{\mathfrak{H}} \\ &= (f_+, T_+g_+)_{\mathfrak{H}_+} + (f_-, T_-g_-)_{\mathfrak{H}_-} \\ &= (T_+f_+, g_+)_{\mathfrak{H}_+} - (\Gamma_1^+f_+, \Gamma_0^+g_+)_{\mathcal{H}} + (\Gamma_0^+f_+, \Gamma_1^+g_+)_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + (T_-f_-, g_-)_{\mathfrak{H}_-} - (\Gamma_1^-f_-, \Gamma_0^-g_-)_{\mathcal{H}} + (\Gamma_0^-f_-, \Gamma_1^-g_-)_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

As $g \in \operatorname{dom}(A)$ one concludes that

$$\Upsilon_0 g = \Gamma_0^+ g_+ = \Gamma_0^- g_-, \quad \Upsilon_1 g = \Gamma_1^+ g_+ = -\Gamma_1^- g_-, \tag{4.18}$$

by (4.7), and hence (4.17) takes on the form

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle \mathcal{A}f, g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2} &= (Tf, g)_{\mathfrak{H}} - (\Gamma_1^+f_+ + \Gamma_1^-f_-, \Upsilon_0 g)_{\mathcal{H}} + (\Gamma_0^+f_+ - \Gamma_0^-f_-, \Upsilon_1 g)_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= (Tf, g)_{\mathfrak{H}} - ([\Gamma_1 f], \Upsilon_0 g)_{\mathcal{H}} + ([\Gamma_0 f], \Upsilon_1 g)_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= {}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle Tf, g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2} - {}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle \Upsilon_0^*[\Gamma_1 f], g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2} + {}_{\mathfrak{H}_{-2}}\langle \Upsilon_1^*[\Gamma_0 f], g\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

where (4.14)–(4.15) were used in the second equality, and (4.10) was employed in the last equality. Since (4.19) is true for all $g \in \operatorname{dom}(A) = \mathfrak{H}_2$ one concludes that

$$\mathcal{A}f = Tf - \Upsilon_0^*[\Gamma_1 f] + \Upsilon_1^*[\Gamma_0 f], \tag{4.20}$$

and making use of the definition of $\mathcal{G}$ and (4.12)–(4.13) one finally obtains

$$f = \mathcal{G}\mathcal{A}f = \mathcal{G}Tf - \mathcal{G}\Upsilon_0^*[\Gamma_1 f] + \mathcal{G}\Upsilon_1^*[\Gamma_0 f] = \mathcal{G}Tf - \mathcal{S}[\Gamma_1 f] + \mathcal{D}[\Gamma_0 f]. \tag{4.21}$$

□

The following corollary can be viewed as an abstract unique continuation result.

Corollary 4.6. *Under the assumptions of Theorem* 4.5*, the following assertions* $(i), (ii)$ *hold:*

(i) *If $T_+f_+ = 0$ for some $f_+ \in \operatorname{dom}(T_+)$ and $\Gamma_0^+f_+ = \Gamma_1^+f_+ = 0$ then $f_+ = 0$.*

(ii) *If $T_-f_- = 0$ for some $f_- \in \operatorname{dom}(T_-)$ and $\Gamma_0^-f_- = \Gamma_1^-f_- = 0$ then $f_- = 0$.*

Proof. We prove item (i), the proof of assertion (ii) being analogous. Assume that $T_+f_+ = 0$ for some $f_+ \in \operatorname{dom}(T_+)$ and $\Gamma_0^+f_+ = \Gamma_1^+f_+ = 0$. Setting $f_- = 0$ one obtains for $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T)$,

$$Tf = 0, \quad [\Gamma_0 f] = \Gamma_0^+f_+ - \Gamma_0^-f_- = 0, \quad [\Gamma_1 f] = \Gamma_1^+f_+ + \Gamma_1^-f_- = 0. \tag{4.22}$$

Hence the third Green identity (4.16) implies $f = 0$ and therefore $f_+ = 0$. □

5. Coupling of Schrödinger Operators on Lipschitz Domains on Manifolds

In this section we illustrate the abstract material in Sections 2–4 with the concrete case of Schrödinger operators on Lipschitz domains on boundaryless Riemannian manifolds, freely borrowing results from [4]. For more details and background information concerning differential geometry and partial differential equations on manifolds the interested reader is referred to [29], [30], [35], and the literature cited there.

Suppose (M,g) is a compact, connected, C^∞, boundaryless Riemannian manifold of (real) dimension $n\in\mathbb{N}$. In local coordinates, the metric tensor g is expressed by

$$g=\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} g_{jk}\,dx_j\otimes dx_k. \tag{5.1}$$

As is customary, we shall use the symbol g to also abbreviate

$$g:=\det\big[(g_{jk})_{1\leq j,k\leq n}\big], \tag{5.2}$$

and we shall use $(g^{jk})_{1\leq j,k\leq n}$ to denote the inverse of the matrix $(g_{jk})_{1\leq j,k\leq n}$, that is,

$$(g^{jk})_{1\leq j,k\leq n}:=\big[(g_{jk})_{1\leq j,k\leq n}\big]^{-1}. \tag{5.3}$$

The volume element $d\mathcal{V}_g$ on M with respect to the Riemannian metric g in (5.1) then can be written in local coordinates as

$$d\mathcal{V}_g(x)=\sqrt{g(x)}\,d^nx. \tag{5.4}$$

Following a common practice, we use $\{\partial_j\}_{1\leq j\leq n}$ to denote a local basis in the tangent bundle TM of the manifold M. This implies that if $X,Y\in TM$ are locally expressed as $X=\sum_{j=1}^n X_j\partial_j$ and $Y=\sum_{j=1}^n Y_j\partial_j$, then

$$\langle X,Y\rangle_{TM}=\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} X_jY_kg_{jk}, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{TM}$ stands for the pointwise inner product in TM.

Next, we discuss the gradient and divergence operators associated with the metric g on the manifold M. Specifically, given an open set $\Omega\subset M$ and some function $f\in C^1(\Omega)$, the gradient of f is the vector field locally defined as

$$\operatorname{grad}_g(f):=\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}(\partial_jf)g^{jk}\partial_k. \tag{5.6}$$

Also, given any vector field $X\in C^1(\Omega,TM)$ locally written as $X=\sum_{j=1}^n X_j\partial_j$, its divergence is given by

$$\operatorname{div}_g(X):=\sum_{j=1}^{n} g^{-1/2}\partial_j(g^{1/2}X_j)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial_jX_j+\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\Gamma^j_{jk}X_k, \tag{5.7}$$

where Γ^i_{jk} are the Christoffel symbols associated with the metric (5.1). The Laplace–Beltrami operator

$$\Delta_g:=\operatorname{div}_g\operatorname{grad}_g, \tag{5.8}$$

is expressed locally as

$$\Delta_g u = \sum_{j,k=1}^{n} g^{-1/2}\partial_j\big(g^{jk}g^{1/2}\partial_k u\big). \tag{5.9}$$

We are interested in working with the Schrödinger operator

$$L := -\Delta_g + V, \tag{5.10}$$

where the potential $V \in L^\infty(M)$ is a real scalar-valued function.

The reader is reminded that the scale of L^2-based Sobolev spaces $H^s(M)$ of fractional smoothness $s \in \mathbb{R}$ on M may be defined in a natural fashion, via localization (using a smooth partition of unity subordinate to a finite cover of M with local coordinate charts) and pull-pack to the Euclidean model. This scale of spaces is then adapted to an open subset Ω of M via restriction, by setting

$$H^s(\Omega) := \big\{u\big|_\Omega \,\big|\, u \in H^s(M)\big\}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{5.11}$$

In particular, $H^0(\Omega)$ coincides with $L^2(\Omega)$, the space of square-integrable functions with respect to the volume element $d\mathcal{V}_g$ in Ω. For each $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we also define

$$\mathring{H}^s(\Omega) := \overline{C_0^\infty(\Omega)}^{H^s(\Omega)}, \tag{5.12}$$

and equip the latter space with the norm inherited from $H^s(\Omega)$.

Since bounded Lipschitz domains in the Euclidean setting are invariant under C^1 diffeomorphisms (cf. [22]), this class may canonically be defined on the manifold M, using local coordinate charts. Given a Lipschitz domain Ω, it is then possible to define (again, in a canonical manner, via localization and pull-back) fractional Sobolev spaces on its boundary, $H^s(\partial\Omega)$, for $s \in [-1, 1]$. In such a scenario one has

$$\big(H^s(\partial\Omega)\big)^* = H^{-s}(\partial\Omega), \quad s \in [-1, 1], \tag{5.13}$$

and $H^0(\partial\Omega)$ coincides with $L^2(\partial\Omega)$, the space of square-integrable functions with respect to the surface measure σ_g induced by the ambient Riemannian metric on $\partial\Omega$. Moreover,

$$\big\{\phi\big|_{\partial\Omega} \,\big|\, \phi \in C^\infty(M)\big\} \text{ is dense in each } H^s(\partial\Omega), \quad s \in [-1, 1], \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$H^{s_0}(\partial\Omega) \hookrightarrow H^{s_1}(\partial\Omega) \text{ continuously, whenever } -1 \le s_1 \le s_0 \le 1. \tag{5.15}$$

In the following the operator A in Sections 3 and 4 will be the Schrödinger operator

$$A := -\Delta_g + V, \quad \operatorname{dom}(A) := H^2(M). \tag{5.16}$$

To proceed, we fix a Lipschitz domain $\Omega_+ \subset M$ and denote

$$\Omega_- := M\backslash\overline{\Omega_+}. \tag{5.17}$$

Then Ω_- is also a Lipschitz domain, sharing a common compact boundary with Ω_+,

$$\mathcal{C} := \partial\Omega_+ = \partial\Omega_-. \tag{5.18}$$

At the global level, it is important to note that A is selfadjoint in the Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(M)$. The decomposition of $M\backslash\mathcal{C}$ into the disjoint union of Ω_+ and Ω_-, induces a direct orthogonal sum decomposition of $\mathfrak{H}$ into two Hilbert spaces $\mathfrak{H}_+$ and $\mathfrak{H}_-$, defined as $\mathfrak{H}_\pm := L^2(\Omega_\pm)$,

$$\mathfrak{H} = L^2(\Omega_+) \oplus L^2(\Omega_-). \tag{5.19}$$

In the following functions on M will be identified with the pair of restrictions onto Ω_+ and Ω_- and a vector notation will be used. For example, for $f \in L^2(M)$ we shall also write $(f_+, f_-)^\top$, where $f_\pm \in L^2(\Omega_\pm)$. This notation is in accordance with the notation in Sections 3 and 4. Also, in the sequel we agree to abbreviate

$$V_\pm := V\big|_{\Omega_\pm} \in L^\infty(\Omega_\pm). \tag{5.20}$$

For $s \geq 0$ we define the Banach spaces

$$H^s_\Delta(\Omega_\pm) := \big\{ f_\pm \in H^s(\Omega_\pm) \,\big|\, \Delta_g f_\pm \in L^2(\Omega_\pm) \big\}, \tag{5.21}$$

equipped with the norms $\|\cdot\|_{H^s_\Delta(\Omega_\pm)}$ defined as

$$\|f_\pm\|_{H^s_\Delta(\Omega_\pm)} := \|f_\pm\|_{H^s(\Omega_\pm)} + \big\|(-\Delta_g + V_\pm) f_\pm\big\|_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)}, \quad f_\pm \in H^s_\Delta(\Omega_\pm). \tag{5.22}$$

The minimal and maximal realizations of $-\Delta_g + V_\pm$ in $L^2(\Omega_\pm)$ are defined by

$$S_{min,\pm} := -\Delta_g + V_\pm, \quad \mathrm{dom}(S_{min,\pm}) = \mathring{H}^2(\Omega_\pm), \tag{5.23}$$

and

$$S_{max,\pm} := -\Delta_g + V_\pm, \quad \mathrm{dom}(S_{max,\pm}) = H^0_\Delta(\Omega_\pm). \tag{5.24}$$

In the next lemma we collect some well-known properties of the operators $S_{min,\pm}$ and $S_{max,\pm}$. A proof of this lemma and some further properties of the minimal and maximal realization of $-\Delta_g + V_\pm$ can be found, for instance, in [4].

Lemma 5.1. *The operators $S_{min,\pm}$ and $S_{max,\pm}$ are densely defined and closed in $L^2(\Omega_\pm)$. The operator $S_{min,\pm}$ is symmetric, semibounded from below, and has infinite deficiency indices. Furthermore, $S_{min,\pm}$ and $S_{max,\pm}$ are adjoints of each other, that is,*

$$\big(S_{min,\pm}\big)^* = S_{max,\pm} \ \text{ and } \ S_{min,\pm} = \big(S_{max,\pm}\big)^*. \tag{5.25}$$

Let $\mathfrak{n}^\pm \in L^\infty(\mathcal{C}, TM)$ be the outward unit normal vectors to $\Omega_\pm$. One observes that in the present situation $\mathfrak{n}^+ = -\mathfrak{n}^-$. The Dirichlet and Neumann trace operators $\tau_D^\pm$ and $\tau_N^\pm$, originally defined by

$$\tau_D^\pm f_\pm := f_\pm \restriction_{\mathcal{C}}, \quad \tau_N^\pm f_\pm := \big\langle \mathfrak{n}^\pm, \mathrm{grad}_g f_\pm \restriction_{\mathcal{C}} \big\rangle_{TM} \tag{5.26}$$

for $f_\pm \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_\pm})$, admit continuous linear extensions to operators

$$\tau_D^\pm : H^s_\Delta(\Omega_\pm) \to H^{s-1/2}(\mathcal{C}) \ \text{ and } \ \tau_N^\pm : H^s_\Delta(\Omega_\pm) \to H^{s-3/2}(\mathcal{C}), \tag{5.27}$$

whose actions are compatible with one another, for all $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$. We refer to [4] where it is also shown that

$$\text{the trace operators } \tau_D^\pm,\ \tau_N^\pm \text{ in (5.27)} \tag{5.28}$$

$$\text{are both surjective for each } s \in [\tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{3}{2}]. \tag{5.29}$$

We wish to augment (5.28) with the following density result.

Lemma 5.2. *The ranges of the mappings*

$$\big\{ f_\pm \in H^{3/2}(\Omega_\pm) \,\big|\, \Delta_g f_\pm \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_\pm}) \big\} \ni f_\pm \mapsto \big(\tau_D^\pm f_\pm, -\tau_N^\pm f_\pm\big) \tag{5.30}$$

are dense in $L^2(\mathcal{C}) \times L^2(\mathcal{C})$.

The proof of Lemma 5.2 requires some preparations. To get started, we fix two potentials $0 \leq V_0^{\pm} \in C^\infty(M)$ which are not identically zero on M, and which vanish on Ω_+, and on Ω_-, respectively. Then (cf. [33, p. 27]) for each $s \in [0,2]$, the operators

$$-\Delta_g + V_0^{\pm} : H^{2-s}(M) \longrightarrow H^{-s}(M) \tag{5.31}$$

$$\text{are invertible, with bounded inverses.} \tag{5.32}$$

Furthermore, for each choice of sign, the said inverses act in a compatible fashion with one another. Abbreviating $\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm} := (-\Delta_g + V_0^{\pm})^{-1}$ then yields two well-defined, linear, and bounded operators

$$\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm} : H^{-s}(M) \longrightarrow H^{2-s}(M) \ \text{ for each } s \in [0,2]. \tag{5.33}$$

The Schwartz kernels of these operators are distributions $E_0^{\pm}$ on $M \times M$ which are smooth outside of the diagonal $\mathrm{diag}M := \{(x,x) : x \in M\}$. In particular, it makes sense to talk about pointwise values $E_0^{\pm}(x,y)$ for $x, y \in M$ with $x \neq y$. Among other things, the functions $E_0^{\pm}(\cdot,\cdot) \in C^\infty\big((M \times M)\backslash \mathrm{diag}M\big)$ satisfy

$$E_0^{\pm}(x,y) = E_0^{\pm}(y,x) \ \text{ for all } \ x, y \in M \ \text{ with } \ x \neq y. \tag{5.34}$$

At this stage, we bring in the single and double layer potentials on Lipschitz domains on manifolds considered in [31]–[33]. Their actions on an arbitrary function $\varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ are, respectively,

$$(\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm}\varphi)(x) := \int_{\mathcal{C}} E_0^{\pm}(x,y)\varphi(y)\, d\sigma_g(y), \quad x \in \Omega_{\pm}, \tag{5.35}$$

and

$$(\mathcal{D}_0^{\pm}\varphi)(x) := \pm \int_{\mathcal{C}} \big\langle \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}(y), \mathrm{grad}_{g_y}[E_0^{\pm}(x,y)]\big\rangle_{T_yM} \varphi(y)\, d\sigma_g(y), \quad x \in \Omega_{\pm}, \tag{5.36}$$

where σ_g is the surface measure induced by the ambient Riemannian metric on $\mathcal{C}$. Let us also consider their boundary versions, that is, the singular integral operators acting on an arbitrary function $\varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ according to

$$(S_0^{\pm}\varphi)(x) := \int_{\mathcal{C}} E_0^{\pm}(x,y)\varphi(y)\, d\sigma_g(y), \quad x \in \mathcal{C}, \tag{5.37}$$

and

$$(K_0^{\pm}\varphi)(x) := \mathrm{P.V.} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \big\langle \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}(y), \mathrm{grad}_{g_y}[E_0^{\pm}(x,y)]\big\rangle_{T_yM} \varphi(y)\, d\sigma_g(y), \quad x \in \mathcal{C}, \tag{5.38}$$

where P.V. indicates that the integral is considered in the principal value sense (i.e., removing a small geodesic ball centered at the singularity and passing to the limit as its radius shrinks to zero). Work in [31]–[33] ensures that the following properties hold:

$$\mathcal{D}_0^{\pm} : L^2(\mathcal{C}) \to H^{1/2}_{\Delta}(\Omega_{\pm}) \ \text{ are linear and bounded operators,} \tag{5.39}$$

$$(-\Delta_g + V_0^{\pm})(\mathcal{D}_0^{\pm}\varphi) = 0 \ \text{ in } \Omega_{\pm}, \text{ for every function } \ \varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}), \tag{5.40}$$

$$K_0^{\pm} : L^2(\mathcal{C}) \to L^2(\mathcal{C}) \ \text{ are linear and bounded operators,} \tag{5.41}$$

$$\tau_D^{\pm}(\mathcal{D}_0^{\pm}\varphi) = \pm\big(\tfrac{1}{2}I + K_0^{\pm}\big)\varphi \ \text{ on } \mathcal{C}, \text{ for each } \ \varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}), \tag{5.42}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm} : L^2(\mathcal{C}) \to H^{3/2}_{\Delta}(\Omega_{\pm}) \ \text{ are linear and bounded operators,} \tag{5.43}$$

$$(-\Delta_g + V_0^{\pm})(\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm}\varphi) = 0 \ \text{ in } \Omega_{\pm}, \text{ for every function } \ \varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}), \tag{5.44}$$

$$S_0^{\pm} : L^2(\mathcal{C}) \to L^2(\mathcal{C}) \ \text{ are linear, bounded, self-adjoint, and injective,} \tag{5.45}$$

$$\tau_D^{\pm}(\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm}\varphi) = S_0^{\pm}\varphi \ \text{ on } \mathcal{C}, \text{ for each function } \ \varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}), \tag{5.46}$$

$$\tau_N^{\pm}(\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm}\varphi) = \big(-\tfrac{1}{2}I + (K_0^{\pm})^*\big)\varphi \ \text{ on } \mathcal{C}, \text{ for every } \ \varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C}), \tag{5.47}$$

where I is the identity operator on $L^2(\mathcal{C})$, and $(K_0^{\pm})^*$ are the adjoints of the operators $K_0^{\pm}$ in (5.41). After this preamble, we are ready to present the proof of Lemma 5.2.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. The density results claimed in the statement follow as soon as we establish that whenever two functions $h_D, h_N \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ satisfy

$$\big(\tau_D^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_D\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} - \big(\tau_N^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_N\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} = 0 \tag{5.48}$$

$$\text{for all } \ f_{\pm} \in H^{3/2}(\Omega_{\pm}) \ \text{ with } \ \Delta_g f_{\pm} \in C^{\infty}(\overline{\Omega_{\pm}}), \tag{5.49}$$

then necessarily $h_D = 0$ and $h_N = 0$. To this end, pick an arbitrary $h \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ and consider $f_{\pm} := \mathcal{S}_0^{\pm} h$ in $\Omega_{\pm}$. Then $f_{\pm} \in H^{3/2}_{\Delta}(\Omega_{\pm})$ due to (5.43). Also, relying on (5.44) and the fact that, by design, the potentials $V_0^{\pm}$ vanish in $\Omega_{\pm}$, we may write $\Delta_g f_{\pm} = (-\Delta_g + V_0^{\pm}) f_{\pm} = 0$ in $\Omega_{\pm}$. Granted these properties of $f_{\pm}$, from (5.48), (5.46), (5.47), and (5.45), one concludes that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \big(\tau_D^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_D\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} - \big(\tau_N^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_N\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \\
&= \big(S_0^{\pm} h, h_D\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} - \Big(\big(-\tfrac{1}{2}I + (K_0^{\pm})^*\big)h \,,\, h_N\Big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \\
&= \big(h, S_0^{\pm} h_D\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} - \big(h \,,\, (-\tfrac{1}{2}I + K_0^{\pm})h_N\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \\
&= \big(h \,,\, S_0^{\pm} h_D - (-\tfrac{1}{2}I + K_0^{\pm})h_N\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.50}$$

With this in hand, the arbitrariness of $h \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ then forces

$$S_0^{\pm} h_D - (-\tfrac{1}{2}I + K_0^{\pm})h_N = 0. \tag{5.51}$$

Next, we pick two arbitrary functions $\phi_{\pm} \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega_{\pm})$ and, this time, consider $f_{\pm} := \mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\phi_{\pm}$ in $\Omega_{\pm}$. Then (5.33) ensures that $f_{\pm} \in H^2(\Omega_{\pm})$. Given that, by design, $V_0^{\pm}$ vanish in $\Omega_{\pm}$, one also has $\Delta_g f_{\pm} = (-\Delta_g + V_0^{\pm})\mathcal{G}_0^{\pm}\phi_{\pm} = \phi_{\pm}$ in $\Omega_{\pm}$. Having established these properties of $f_{\pm}$, (5.48) implies that

$$\big(\tau_D^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_D\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} - \big(\tau_N^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_N\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} = 0. \tag{5.52}$$

Now we take a closer look at the two terms in the left-hand side of (5.52). For the first term we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(\tau_D^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_D\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} &= \int_{\mathcal{C}} \Big(\int_{\Omega_{\pm}} E_0^{\pm}(x,y)\overline{\phi_{\pm}(y)}\, d\mathcal{V}_g(y)\Big) h_D(x)\, d\sigma_g(x) \\
&= \int_{\Omega_{\pm}} \Big(\int_{\mathcal{C}} E_0^{\pm}(x,y) h_D(x)\, d\sigma_g(x)\Big)\overline{\phi_{\pm}(y)}\, d\mathcal{V}_g(y) \\
&= \int_{\Omega_{\pm}} (\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm} h_D)(y)\overline{\phi_{\pm}(y)}\, d\mathcal{V}_g(y),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.53}$$

where the first equality uses the definition of $E_0^{\pm}(x,y)$, the second equality is based on Fubini's theorem, while the third equality is a consequence of (5.34) and (5.35). For the second term in (5.52) we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\tau_N^{\pm} f_{\pm}, h_N\big)_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} \\
&\quad = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \Big(\int_{\Omega_{\pm}} \big\langle \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}(x), \operatorname{grad}_{g_x}[E_0^{\pm}(x,y)]\big\rangle_{T_xM} \overline{\phi_{\pm}(y)}\, d\mathcal{V}_g(y)\Big) h_N(x)\, d\sigma_g(x) \\
&\quad = \int_{\Omega_{\pm}} \Big(\int_{\mathcal{C}} \big\langle \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}(x), \operatorname{grad}_{g_x}[E_0^{\pm}(x,y)]\big\rangle_{T_xM} h_N(x)\, d\sigma_g(x)\Big) \overline{\phi_{\pm}(y)}\, d\mathcal{V}_g(y) \\
&\quad = \pm \int_{\Omega_{\pm}} (\mathcal{D}_0^{\pm} h_N)(y) \overline{\phi_{\pm}(y)}\, d\mathcal{V}_g(y), \qquad (5.54)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality relies on the definition of $E_0^{\pm}(x,y)$, the second equality uses Fubini's theorem, while the third equality is implied by (5.34) and (5.36).

Together, (5.52), (5.53), and (5.54) imply that

$$\int_{\Omega_{\pm}} \Big\{ (\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm} h_D)(y) \mp (\mathcal{D}_0^{\pm} h_N)(y) \Big\} \overline{\phi_{\pm}(y)}\, d\mathcal{V}_g(y) = 0 \qquad (5.55)$$

which, in view of the arbitrariness of $\phi_{\pm} \in C_0^{\infty}(\Omega_{\pm})$, forces

$$\mathcal{S}_0^{\pm} h_D \mp \mathcal{D}_0^{\pm} h_N = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_{\pm}. \qquad (5.56)$$

Applying $\tau_D^{\pm}$ to both sides of (5.56) then yields, on account of (5.46) and (5.42),

$$S_0^{\pm} h_D - \big(\tfrac{1}{2} I + K_0^{\pm}\big) h_N = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{C}. \qquad (5.57)$$

The end-game in the proof of the lemma is as follows. Subtracting (5.57) from (5.51) proves that $h_N = 0$. Using this back into (5.57) leads to $S_0^{\pm} h_D = 0$ which, in light of the injectivity of the single layer operators in (5.45), shows that $h_D = 0$ as well. Hence, $h_D = h_N = 0$, as desired. □

Going further, in the next theorem we define quasi boundary triples for $S_{max,\pm} = \big(S_{min,\pm}\big)^*$ with the natural trace maps as boundary maps defined on the domain of the operators

$$T_{\pm} := -\Delta_g + V_{\pm}, \quad \operatorname{dom}(T_{\pm}) := H_{\Delta}^{3/2}(\Omega_{\pm}), \qquad (5.58)$$

in $L^2(\Omega_{\pm})$. One recalls that

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_+ & 0 \\ 0 & T_- \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } L^2(M) = L^2(\Omega_+) \oplus L^2(\Omega_-). \qquad (5.59)$$

With this choice of boundary maps the values of the corresponding Weyl function are Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps (up to a minus sign).

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\Omega_{\pm}$ and $T_{\pm}$ be as above, and let*

$$\Gamma_0^{\pm}, \Gamma_1^{\pm} : H_{\Delta}^{3/2}(\Omega_{\pm}) \to L^2(\mathcal{C}), \quad \Gamma_0^{\pm} f_{\pm} := \tau_D^{\pm} f_{\pm}, \quad \Gamma_1^{\pm} f_{\pm} := -\tau_N^{\pm} f_{\pm}. \qquad (5.60)$$

Then $\{L^2(\mathcal{C}), \Gamma_0^{\pm}, \Gamma_1^{\pm}\}$ are quasi boundary triples for $T_{\pm} \subset S_{max,\pm}$ such that

$$S_{min,\pm} = T_{\pm} \restriction \big(\ker(\Gamma_0^{\pm}) \cap \ker(\Gamma_1^{\pm}) \big). \qquad (5.61)$$

In addition, the following statements (i)–(iii) hold:

(i) The Dirichlet realizations $A_{D,\pm}$ and the Neumann realizations $A_{N,\pm}$ of $-\Delta_g+V_\pm$ in $L^2(\Omega_\pm)$ coincide with $A_{0,\pm}=T\restriction\ker(\Gamma_0^\pm)$ and $A_{1,\pm}=T\restriction\ker(\Gamma_1^\pm)$, respectively,

$$A_{D,\pm}=T_\pm\restriction\ker(\Gamma_0^\pm)=(-\Delta_g+V_\pm)\restriction\big\{f_\pm\in H^{3/2}_\Delta(\Omega_\pm)\,\big|\,\tau_D^\pm f_\pm=0\big\},\tag{5.62}$$

$$A_{N,\pm}=T_\pm\restriction\ker(\Gamma_1^\pm)=(-\Delta_g+V_\pm)\restriction\big\{f_\pm\in H^{3/2}_\Delta(\Omega_\pm)\,\big|\,\tau_N^\pm f_\pm=0\big\},\tag{5.63}$$

and both operators are self-adjoint in $L^2(\Omega_\pm)$.

(ii) The values $\gamma_\pm(z):L^2(\mathcal{C})\supset H^1(\mathcal{C})\to L^2(\Omega_\pm)$ of the γ-fields are given by

$$\gamma_\pm(z)\varphi=f_\pm,\quad \varphi\in H^1(\mathcal{C}),\quad z\in\rho(A_{D,\pm}),\tag{5.64}$$

where $f_\pm\in L^2(\Omega_\pm)$ are the unique solutions of the boundary value problems

$$f_\pm\in H^{3/2}_\Delta(\Omega_\pm),\quad (-\Delta_g+V_\pm-z)f_\pm=0,\quad \tau_D^\pm f_\pm=\varphi.\tag{5.65}$$

(iii) The values $M_\pm(z):L^2(\mathcal{C})\supset H^1(\mathcal{C})\to L^2(\mathcal{C})$ of the Weyl functions are Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps, given by

$$M_\pm(z)\varphi=-\tau_N^\pm f_\pm,\quad \varphi\in H^1(\mathcal{C}),\quad z\in\rho(A_{D,\pm}),\tag{5.66}$$

where $f_\pm=\gamma_\pm(z)\varphi$ are the unique solutions of (5.65).

Proof. Let us verify the properties stipulated in Definition 2.1 in the current case. First, the abstract Green identity (2.1) presently corresponds to the second Green identity for the Schrödinger operator (5.10) on the Lipschitz domain Ω, proved in [4]. Second, the fact that $\mathrm{ran}(\Gamma_0^\pm,\Gamma_1^\pm)^\top$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{C})\times L^2(\mathcal{C})$ is readily implied by Lemma 5.2 (bearing in mind (5.21)). Third, the self-adjointness of $A_{0,\pm}=T_\pm\restriction\ker(\Gamma_0^\pm)$ is clear from the fact that these operators coincide with the self-adjoint Dirichlet realizations of $-\Delta_g+V_\pm$ in $\Omega_\pm$ studied in [4].

Fourth, we focus on establishing that $\overline{T}_\pm=S_{max,\pm}$. In turn, since $\mathrm{dom}(T_\pm)$ contains $\mathrm{dom}(A_{D,\pm})+\mathrm{dom}(A_{N,\pm})$, this is going to be a consequence of the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{dom}(A_{D,\pm})+\mathrm{dom}(A_{N,\pm})\text{ is dense in }\mathrm{dom}(S_{max,\pm})\\&\quad\text{with respect to the graph norm.}\end{aligned}\tag{5.67}$$

To prove (5.67), we assume that $h\in\mathrm{dom}(S_{max,\pm})$ is such that

$$\begin{aligned}&(f_D+f_N,h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)}+(S_{max,\pm}(f_D+f_N),S_{max,\pm}h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)}=0\\&\quad\text{for all }\ f_D\in\mathrm{dom}(A_{D,\pm}),\ f_N\in\mathrm{dom}(A_{N,\pm}).\end{aligned}\tag{5.68}$$

Then

$$(A_{D,\pm}f_D,S_{max,\pm}h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)}=(f_D,-h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)},\quad f_D\in\mathrm{dom}(A_{D,\pm}),\tag{5.69}$$

and

$$(A_{N,\pm}f_N,S_{max,\pm}h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)}=(f_N,-h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)},\quad f_N\in\mathrm{dom}(A_{N,\pm}).\tag{5.70}$$

Together, (5.69) and (5.70) prove that

$$\begin{aligned}&S_{max,\pm}h\in\mathrm{dom}(A_{D,\pm})\cap\mathrm{dom}(A_{N,\pm})=\mathrm{dom}(S_{min,\pm})\\&\quad\text{and }\ S_{min,\pm}S_{max,\pm}h=-h.\end{aligned}\tag{5.71}$$

Finally, from

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\big((I+S_{min,\pm}S_{max,\pm})h,h\big)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)}\\&=(h,h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)}+(S_{max,\pm}h,S_{max,\pm}h)_{L^2(\Omega_\pm)},\end{aligned}\tag{5.72}$$

one concludes that $h = 0$. Hence (5.67) holds, completing the proof of the fact that $\overline{T}_\pm = S_{max,\pm}$.

This shows that $\{L^2(\mathcal{C}), \Gamma_0^\pm, \Gamma_1^\pm\}$ are indeed quasi boundary triples for $T_\pm$. That $T_\pm \subset S_{max,\pm}$ is clear from definitions, while (5.61) has been established in [4].

Thanks to work in [4], the assertions in (ii) and (iii) follow immediately from the definition of the γ-field and the Weyl function. We refer the interested reader to [4] for more details. Here we only wish to note that in the case of a bounded Lipschitz domain in the flat Euclidean setting (i.e., $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with the standard metric) a similar result has been established in [8, Theorem 4.1]. □

In the following we establish the link to the coupling procedure discussed in Section 3. First of all we set $\mathcal{H} := L^2(\mathcal{C})$ so that the quasi boundary triples in Section 3 are those in Theorem 5.3. The operator S in (3.4) is the direct orthogonal sum of the minimal realizations $S_{min,+}$ and $S_{min,-}$,

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} S_{min,+} & 0 \\ 0 & S_{min,-} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.73}$$

and the boundary mappings in the quasi boundary triple $\{L^2(\mathcal{C}) \oplus L^2(\mathcal{C}), \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1\}$ in (3.7) are now given by

$$\Gamma_0 f = \begin{pmatrix} \tau_D^+ f_+ \\ \tau_D^- f_- \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \Gamma_1 f = \begin{pmatrix} -\tau_N^+ f_+ \\ -\tau_N^- f_- \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.74}$$

where $f = (f_+, f_-) \in \operatorname{dom}(T)$ with $T_\pm$, T given as in (5.58), (5.59). The self-adjoint operator corresponding to $\ker(\Gamma_0)$ is the orthogonal sum of the Dirichlet operators $A_{D,+}$ and $A_{D,-}$ in $L^2(\Omega_+)$ and $L^2(\Omega_-)$, respectively,

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} A_{D,+} & 0 \\ 0 & A_{D,-} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.75}$$

The following lemma shows that the coupling of the quasi boundary triples $\{L^2(\mathcal{C}), \Gamma_0^+, \Gamma_1^+\}$ and $\{L^2(\mathcal{C}), \Gamma_0^-, \Gamma_1^-\}$ in Theorem 3.1 leads to the self-adjoint Schrödinger operator in (5.16).

Lemma 5.4. *The operator*

$$T \upharpoonright \big\{ f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T) \,\big|\, \Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \Gamma_0^- f_-,\, \Gamma_1^+ f_+ = -\Gamma_1^- f_- \big\} \tag{5.76}$$

coincides with the self-adjoint operator A in (5.16).

Proof. Since any function $f \in H^2(M)$ satisfies

$$\Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \tau_D^+ f_+ = \tau_D^- f_- = \Gamma_0^- f_-, \tag{5.77}$$

$$\Gamma_1^+ f_+ = -\tau_N^+ f_+ = \tau_N^- f_- = -\Gamma_1^- f_-, \tag{5.78}$$

and $f_\pm \in H^2(\Omega_\pm) \subset H^{3/2}_\Delta(\Omega_\pm) = \operatorname{dom}(T_\pm)$, it follows that $H^2(M) = \operatorname{dom}(A)$ is contained in the domain of the operator in (5.76). On the other hand, it follows from Theorem 3.1 (i) that the operator in (5.76) is symmetric, and hence self-adjoint (as it extends the self-adjoint operator A). □

As an immediate consequence of the observation in Lemma 5.4 we obtain the next corollary. First, we note that the self-adjointness of the operator A in (5.16), Theorem 3.1, and the fact that

$$A = T \upharpoonright \big\{ f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T) \,\big|\, \Gamma_0^+ f_+ = \Gamma_0^- f_-,\, \Gamma_1^+ f_+ = -\Gamma_1^- f_- \big\}, \tag{5.79}$$

imply

$$\operatorname{ran}\big(\Gamma_1^{\pm}\restriction \operatorname{dom}(A_{D,\pm})\big)\subseteq \operatorname{ran}\big(M_+(z)+M_-(z)\big),\quad z\in\mathbb{C}_+\cup\mathbb{C}_-, \tag{5.80}$$

where $M_\pm$ are (minus) the Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps in (5.66).

Corollary 5.5. *Let A_0 be the orthogonal sum of the Dirichlet operators in* (5.75)*, let $M_\pm$ be the (minus) Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps in* (5.66) *and let γ be the orthogonal sum of the γ-fields in* (5.64) (*cf.* (3.9))*. For all $z\in\rho(A)\cap\rho(A_0)$, the resolvent of A is given by*

$$(A-zI_{L^2(M)})^{-1}=(A_0-zI_{L^2(M)})^{-1}+\gamma(z)\Theta(z)\gamma(\overline{z})^*, \tag{5.81}$$

where

$$\Theta(z)=\begin{pmatrix}-(M_+(z)+M_-(z))^{-1} & -(M_+(z)+M_-(z))^{-1}\\ -(M_+(z)+M_-(z))^{-1} & -(M_+(z)+M_-(z))^{-1}\end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.82}$$

In a similar way one obtains a representation for the resolvent of A from Theorem 3.3, where $(A-zI_{L^2(M)})^{-1}$ is compared with the orthogonal sum of the self-adjoint Dirichlet operator $A_{D,+}$ in $L^2(\Omega_+)$ and the self-adjoint Neumann operator $A_{N,-}$ in $L^2(\Omega_-)$.

Corollary 5.6. *Let $M_\pm$ be the (minus) Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps in* (5.66) *and let $\gamma_\pm$ be the γ-fields in* (5.64)*. For all $z\in\rho(A)\cap\rho(A_{D,+})\cap\rho(A_{D,-})\cap\rho(A_{N,-})$, the resolvent of A is given by*

$$(A-zI_{L^2(M)})^{-1}=\left(\begin{pmatrix}A_{D,+} & 0\\ 0 & A_{N,-}\end{pmatrix}-zI_{L^2(M)}\right)^{-1}+\widehat{\gamma}(z)\Sigma(z)\widehat{\gamma}(\overline{z})^*, \tag{5.83}$$

where

$$\widehat{\gamma}(z)=\begin{pmatrix}\gamma_+(z) & 0\\ 0 & \gamma_-(z)M_-(z)^{-1}\end{pmatrix},\quad \Sigma(z)=-\begin{pmatrix}M_+(z) & I_{L^2(\mathcal{C})}\\ I_{L^2(\mathcal{C})} & -M_-(z)^{-1}\end{pmatrix}^{-1}. \tag{5.84}$$

Our next aim is to illustrate the abstract third Green identity from Section 4 in the present context of Schrödinger operators on Lipschitz domains on smooth, boundaryless Riemannian manifolds. Since $\operatorname{dom}(A)=H^2(M)$ and the graph norm (4.2) is equivalent to the usual norm on the Sobolev space $H^2(M)$ we have $\mathfrak{H}_2=H^2(M)$ and hence the Gelfand triple in (4.5) is of the form

$$H^2(M)\hookrightarrow L^2(M)\hookrightarrow H^{-2}(M). \tag{5.85}$$

Using the notation in (4.7) we note that the mappings

$$\Upsilon_0=\tau_D^+:H^2(M)\to L^2(\mathcal{C}),\quad \Upsilon_1=-\tau_N^+:H^2(M)\to L^2(\mathcal{C}) \tag{5.86}$$

are bounded, which is clearly in accordance (and also follows from) Lemma 4.2. Thus, the dual operators

$$\Upsilon_0^*=(\tau_D^+)^*:L^2(\mathcal{C})\to H^{-2}(M),\quad \Upsilon_1^*=(-\tau_N^+)^*:L^2(\mathcal{C})\to H^{-2}(M) \tag{5.87}$$

are bounded. Moreover, under the additional assumption that

$$V\geq 0 \text{ and not identically zero on } M, \tag{5.88}$$

it has been proved in [33, p. 27] that

$$-\Delta_g+V:L^2(M)\to H^{-2}(M) \text{ is invertible, with bounded inverse.} \tag{5.89}$$

In such a scenario, if $\mathcal{G}:H^{-2}(M)\to L^2(M)$ denotes the inverse of (5.89), it follows that

$$\mathcal{G}(-\Delta_g+V)f=f,\quad f\in\operatorname{dom}(T)=H^{3/2}_\Delta(\Omega_+)\times H^{3/2}_\Delta(\Omega_-). \tag{5.90}$$

Then the (abstract) single and double layer potentials in (4.12) and (4.13) are given by

$$\mathcal{S} : L^2(\mathcal{C}) \to L^2(M), \quad \varphi \mapsto \mathcal{G}\Upsilon_0^*\varphi = \mathcal{G}(\tau_D^+)^*\varphi, \tag{5.91}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D} : L^2(\mathcal{C}) \to L^2(M), \quad \varphi \mapsto \mathcal{G}\Upsilon_1^*\varphi = \mathcal{G}(-\tau_N^+)^*\varphi. \tag{5.92}$$

Moreover, if $E(x,y)$ is the integral kernel of $\mathcal{G}$, then the action of these abstract single and double layer potentials on a function $\varphi \in L^2(\mathcal{C})$ may be explicitly written as

$$(\mathcal{S}\varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} E(x,y)\varphi(y)\, d\sigma_g(y), \quad x \in M, \tag{5.93}$$

and

$$(\mathcal{D}\varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{C}} \big\langle \mathfrak{n}^+(y), \operatorname{grad}_{g_y} E(x,y)\big\rangle_{T_yM} \varphi(y)\, d\sigma_g(y), \quad x \in M, \tag{5.94}$$

which are in agreement with (5.35), (5.36). Furthermore, the abstract jump relations in (4.14)–(4.15) are

$$[\Gamma_0 f] = \Gamma_0^+ f_+ - \Gamma_0^- f_- = \tau_D^+ f_+ - \tau_D^- f_-, \quad f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T), \tag{5.95}$$

$$[\Gamma_1 f] = \Gamma_1^+ f_+ + \Gamma_1^- f_- = -\tau_N^+ f_+ - \tau_N^- f_-, \quad f = (f_+, f_-)^\top \in \operatorname{dom}(T). \tag{5.96}$$

As a consequence of the above considerations and Theorem 4.5 we obtain the following version of Green's third identity for the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta_g + V$ on M.

Theorem 5.7. *With the fundamental solution operator $\mathcal{G}$ in* (5.90)*, the layer potentials in* (5.91)–(5.92)*, and the jump relations in* (5.95)–(5.96)*, one has*

$$f = \mathcal{G}Tf + \mathcal{D}[\Gamma_0 f] - \mathcal{S}[\Gamma_1 f], \quad f \in \operatorname{dom}(T), \tag{5.97}$$

(i.e., $f = (f_+, f_-)^\top$ with $f_\pm \in H^{3/2}_\Delta(\Omega_\pm)$).

In conclusion, we note that boundary triples for elliptic operator in an unbounded external domain $\Omega_- \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, used as an illustration in the introduction, were studied, for instance, in [7], [27]. The third Green formula in this situation and its analog in connection with noncompact Riemannian manifolds M requires additional techniques to be discussed elsewhere.

Acknowledgments. We are indebted to Mark Ashbaugh, Damir Kinzebulatov, and Michael Pang for very helpful discussions.

References

[1] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, Dover, New York, 1972.

[2] N. Aronszajn, *A unique continuation theorem for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations or inequalities of second order*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **36**, 235–249 (1957).

[3] N. Aronszajn, A. Krzywicki, and J. Szarski, *A unique continuation theorem for exterior differential forms on Riemannian manifolds*, Ark. Mat. **4**, 417–453 (1962).

[4] J. Behrndt, F. Gesztesy, T. Micheler, and M. Mitrea, *Sharp boundary trace theory and Schrödinger operators on bounded Lipschitz domains*, in preparation.

[5] J. Behrndt and M. Langer, *Boundary value problems for elliptic partial differential operators on bounded domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **243**, 536–565 (2007).

[6] J. Behrndt and M. Langer, *Elliptic operators, Dirichlet-to-Neumann maps and quasi boundary triples*, in *Operator Methods for Boundary Value Problems*, S. Hassi, H. S. V. e Snoo, and F. H. Szafraniec (eds.), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series, Vol. 404, 2012, pp. 121–160.

[7] J. Behrndt, M. Langer, and V. Lotoreichik, *Spectral estimates for resolvent differences of self-adjoint elliptic operators*, Integral Eq. Operator Theory **77**, 1–37 (2013).
[8] J. Behrndt and T. Micheler, *Elliptic differential operators on Lipschitz domains and abstract boundary value problems*, J. Funct. Anal. **267**, 3657–3709 (2014).
[9] J. Behrndt and J. Rohleder, *An inverse problem of Calderón type with partial data*, Commun. Part. Diff. Eq., **37**, 1141–1159 (2012).
[10] Yu. M. Berezanskiĭ, *Selfadjoint Operators in Spaces of Functions of Infinitely Many Variables*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **63**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1986.
[11] V. M. Bruk, *On a class of problems with the spectral parameter in the boundary conditions*, Mat. Sbornik **100**, 210–216 (1976).
[12] M. Costabel, *Boundary integral operators on Lipschitz domains: Elementary results*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **19**, 613–626 (1988).
[13] J. W. Calkin, *Abstract symmetric boundary conditions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **45**, 369–442 (1939).
[14] V. A. Derkach, S. Hassi, M. M. Malamud, and H. S. V. de Snoo, *Generalized resolvents of symmetric operators and admissibility*, Methods Funct. Anal. Topology **6**, 24–53 (2000).
[15] V. A. Derkach, S. Hassi, M. M. Malamud, and H. S. V. de Snoo, *Boundary relations and their Weyl families*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **358**, 5351–5400 (2006).
[16] V. A. Derkach, S. Hassi, M. M. Malamud, and H. S. V. de Snoo, *Boundary relations and generalized resolvents of symmetric operators*, Russ. J. Math. Phys. **16**, 17–60 (2009).
[17] V. A. Derkach, S. Hassi, M. M. Malamud, and H. S. V. de Snoo, *Boundary triplets and Weyl functions. Recent developments*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes, Vol. 404, (2012), pp. 161–220.
[18] V. A. Derkach and M. M. Malamud, *Generalized resolvents and the boundary value problems for Hermitian operators with gaps*, J. Funct. Anal. **95**, 1–95 (1991).
[19] V. A. Derkach and M. M. Malamud, *The extension theory of Hermitian operators and the moment problem*, J. Math. Sci. **73**, 141–242 (1995).
[20] N. Filonov, *Second-order elliptic equation of divergence form having a compactly supported solution*, J. Math. Sci. (New York) **106**, 3078–3086 (2001).
[21] V. I. Gorbachuk and M. L. Gorbachuk, *Boundary Value Problems for Operator Differential Equations*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991.
[22] S. Hofmann, M. Mitrea, and M. Taylor, *Geometric and transformational properties of Lipschitz domains, Semmes-Kenig-Toro domains, and other classes of finite perimeter domains*, J. Geom. Anal. **17**, 593–647 (2007).
[23] D. Jerison and C.E. Kenig, *Unique continuation and absence of positive eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators*, Ann. of Math. (2) **121**, 463–494 (1985).
[24] H. Koch and D. Tataru, *Carleman estimates and unique continuation for second-order elliptic equations with nonsmooth coefficients*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **54**, 339–360 (2001)
[25] H. Koch and D. Tataru, *Sharp counterexamples in unique continuation for second order elliptic equations*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **542**, 133–146 (2002).
[26] A. N. Kochubei, *Extensions of symmetric operators and symmetric binary relations*, Math. Notes **17**, 25–28 (1975).
[27] M. M. Malamud, *Spectral theory of elliptic operators in exterior domains*, Russ. J. Math. Phys. **17**, 96–125 (2010).
[28] W. McLean, *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
[29] D. Mitrea, I. Mitrea, M. Mitrea, and M. Taylor, *The Hodge-Laplacian: Boundary Value Problems on Riemannian Manifolds*, Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 64, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2016.
[30] D. Mitrea, M. Mitrea, and M. Taylor, *Layer Potentials, the Hodge Laplacian and Global Boundary Problems in Non-Smooth Riemannian Manifolds*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 150, No. 713, Providence RI, 2001.
[31] M. Mitrea and M. Taylor, *Boundary layer methods for Lipschitz domains in Riemannian manifolds*, J. Funct. Anal. **163**, 181–251 (1999).
[32] M. Mitrea and M. Taylor, *Potential theory on Lipschitz domains in Riemannian manifolds: Hölder continuous metric tensors*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **25**, 1487–1536 (2000).

[33] M. Mitrea and M. Taylor, *Potential theory on Lipschitz domains in Riemannian manifolds: Sobolev-Besov space results and the Poisson problem*, J. Funct. Anal. **176**, 1–79 (2000).
[34] F. Rellich, *Darstellung der Eigenwerte von* $\Delta u + \lambda u = 0$ *durch ein Randintegral*, Math. Z. **46**, 635–636 (1940).
[35] M. Taylor, *Partial Differential Equations*, Vol. I–III, Springer-Verlag, 1996 (2nd ed., 2011).
[36] T. H. Wolff, *Recent work on sharp estimates in second-order elliptic unique continuation problems*, J. Geom. Anal. **3**, 621–650 (1993).

Institut für Numerische Mathematik, Technische Universität Graz, Steyrergasse 30, 8010 Graz, Austria
E-mail address: behrndt@tugraz.at
URL: www.math.tugraz.at/~behrndt/

Department of Mathematics, Dragomanov National Pedagogical University, Kiev, Pirogova 9, 01601, Ukraine
E-mail address: derkach.v@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA
E-mail address: gesztesyf@missouri.edu
URL: http://www.math.missouri.edu/personnel/faculty/gesztesyf.html

Address after August 1, 2016: Department of Mathematics Baylor University, One Bear Place #97328, Waco, TX 76798-7328, USA
E-mail address: Fritz_Gesztesy@baylor.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA
E-mail address: mitream@missouri.edu
URL: http://www.math.missouri.edu/personnel/faculty/mitream.html